

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/978,839

Applicant(s)

Martin et al.

Examiner

Ljiljana V. Ciric

JVC

Group Art Unit

3743



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ljiljana V. Ciric

(3) _____

(2) Thomas J. Burger

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 6, 1999Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 1-11

Identification of prior art discussed:

n/a

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Upon reviewing applicant's amendment filed on June 21, 1999 and updating the prior art search as required, Examiner Ciric telephoned Attorney Burger in order to initiate discussion regarding a proposed examiner's amendment (marked-up draft copy attached; same was faxed to Attorney Burger on August 5, 1999) in order to render the application allowable. Attorney Burger did not agree to proposed changes in view of applicant's proposal for a substitute claim 1 (copy attached; same was faxed by Attorney Burger to Examiner Ciric earlier on August 6, 1999). Examiner Ciric noted that new proposed claim 1 was broader than existing claim 1 in the application because limitation relating to ignition of waste in the charging area above the grate is non-existent in the new proposed claim. Also, proposed new claim 1 does not cure several existing 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph type problems in the claim and furthermore introduces new problems of this type. Examiner Ciric indicated that an Office action in the form of a final rejection would be generated.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.